

Appln. No. 10/617,285
Amdt. Dated April 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of October 21, 2004

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected most of the claims under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over certain claims of United States Patent No. 6,637,856 B2 (Nishi et al.). Applicant submits herewith a Terminal Disclaimer, and therefore it is respectfully requested that the Examiner's rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to those claims which were not rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, i.e., claims 15-17/1 to 14 and 33-35/19 to 32, these claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, based on Nishi et al. Applicant respectfully traverses, and respectfully submits that these claims are, in fact, patentable over what is disclosed in Nishi et al., and that such is evident when such claims are read in their entirety, along with the limitations present in the claims from which they depend.


In the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected several claims for lacking antecedent bases. These claims have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions to correct the problem. In addition, each of the independent claims have been amended to clarify the claims.

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow all claims in the application.

Appln. No. 10/617,285
Amdt. Dated April 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of October 21, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 20, 2005


Robert Depke, Reg. No. 37,607
James R. Foley, Reg. No. 39,979
**Trexler, Bushnell, Giangiorgi,
Blackstone & Marr, Ltd.**
105 W. Adams, 36th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60603
Tel: (312) 704-1890
Attorneys for Applicant